R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 010 824 24

HISTORY OF ENGLISH, PART TWO. LANGUAGE CURRICULUM IV, STUDENT VERSION.

BY- KITZHABER, ALBERT R.
OREGON UNIV., EUGENE

REPORT NUMBER CRP-H-149-60
REPORT NUMBER BR-5-0366-60
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$1.08 27P.

DESCRIPTORS- *CURRICULUM GUIDES, LINGUISTICS, *LITERATURE, LITERATURE APPRECIATION, *ENGLISH, ENGLISH LITERATURE, *MODERN LANGUAGES, GRADE 10, HISTORY, *LANGUAGE GUIDES, *STUDY GUIDES, INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS, ENGLISH CURRICULUM, SECONDARY EDUCATION, CURRICULUM RESEARCH, EUGENE, PROJECT ENGLISH, NEW GRAMMAR, SHAKESPEARE

A DISCUSSION OF THE HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE WAS CONTINUED (PART 1 IS ED 010 823) TO GIVE THE 10TH-GRADE STUDENT AN ACCURATE PICTURE OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE AT AN IMPORTANT STAGE IN ITS DEVELOPMENT. THE TIME CHOSEN WAS THE 17TH CENTURY, AND THE EXAMPLE WAS SHAKESPEARE'S "JULIUS CAESAR." THIS PLAY WAS CHOSEN AS AN EXAMPLE BECAUSE OF THE WIDESPREAD AND ENDURING POPULARITY OF SHAKESPEARE'S WORKS, AS WELL AS THE RELATIVE EASE OF READING SUCH WORKS BY A MODERN AUDIENCE. (THESE WORKS ALSO EXEMPLIFY IN THEIR STYLE, GRAMMAR, AND LANGUAGE A PERIOD OF STANDARDIZATION OF MODERN ENGLISH.) VOCABULARY, MEANING, GRAMMAR, AND PRONUNCIATION CHANGES WERE ILLUSTRATED BETWEEN THE EARLY MODERN ENGLISH OF SHAKESPEARE AND THE ENGLISH OF TODAY, AND RELATED STUDENT EXERCISES WERE SUGGESTED. THIS INTRODUCTION TO THE "HISTORY OF ENGLISH" NOT ONLY DEALT WITH CHANGES AFFECTING THE PRESENT ENGLISH LANGUAGE BUT SERVED AS AN INTRODUCTION TO THE MIDDLE ENGLISH OF CHAUCER WHICH WAS TO BE STUDIED IN A SUBSEQUENT UNIT. RELATED REPORTS ARE ED 010 129 THROUGH ED 010 160 AND ED 010 803 THROUGH ED 010 832. (FM)

OREGON CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER

HISTORY OF ENGLISH, Part Two

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Language Curriculum IV

Student Version

The project reported herein was supported through the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

CONTENTS

I. Introduction to the Student

II. Review of Vocabulary Changes

III. Grammar of Early Modern English

A. Review of items from Part One

B. Additional items of grammar

IV. The Sounds of English

A. Sound change

B. A special alphabet

C. Shakespeare's pronunciation

V. Conclusion

VI. Additional reading

VII. Suggested Assignments

I. Introduction to the Student

In a previous unit, you were given a brief introduction to the history of your language. Since the first unit was intended to be a general introduction to the study of language history, it probably raised more questions than it answered. This is as it should be, for we scarcely scratched the surface in the area of vocabulary change, and we certainly did not cover all the important differences between Shakespeare's grammer and our own. You may have noticed that the pronunciation of Early Modern English was ignored altogether. In this unit, however, we plan to go back and pick up the loose ends that were not included in Part One. You must keep in mind that all parts of a language undergo change as it is passed on from one generation to another. Not only have our English vocabulary and grammar changed during the past four centuries, but our English speech sounds as well.

II. Review of Vocabulary Changes

The Merchant of Venice, a Shakespearean play written about 1600, provided examples for the previous unit on Early Modern English, but a new play, Julius Caesar,[1] has been selected for Part Two. Since the two plays were written within a year or so of each other, they should provide rather uniform examples of the language of London at the beginning of the seventeenth century. All examples of Shakespeare's English in this unit are taken from the Folger Library edition of Julius Caesar, and the numerals following each quotation refer to the act, scene, and line(s), respectively.

You will remember that the vocabulary of any language can change in a variety of ways: (1) words can be lost from the language or at least disappear from common usage, (2) new words can be added from several sources, and (3) the meanings of words can change in a variety of ways. Each of these items will be reviewed briefly.

A. Word losses and borrowings

Many words that Shakespeare put into the mouths of his characters are not in common use today. A quick look through the play will turn up such unfamiliar items as fain, betimes, wont, vouchsafe, withal, swoonded, chidden, thews, fleering, hie, wafture, rheumy, sooth, severally, dint, belike, mettle, choler, and bestow. None of these words is likely to occur in the everyday speech of present-day Americans, and very few of them would likely be found in the conversation of learned men. In fact, only when reading the literature of the distant past do we need to know any of them. Thus we see that words in common use during one period of history are often displaced by other words, while others simply disappear along with the concepts for which they stood.

---

[1] Louis B. Wright and Virginia A. Lamar, eds., Julius Caesar, The Folger Library General Reader's Shakespeare (Washington Square Press edition, W 112, New York, 1960.)

Sometimes a perfectly respectable and useful native word (those words found in the earliest stages of English) is displaced by one borrowed from a language like Latin or French. For instance, the native word wont, used frequently in Shakespeare's time in expressions like "I was wont to have. . .," has been replaced by accustomed, a borrowing out of Old French, and by the useful expression used to. But sometimes native words are pushed out of the vocabulary by other native words having similar meanings. Fain and as lief, used after had or would since earliest times, are no longer common; the native words gladly and willingly have taken their places. Sometimes an elegant word is borrowed during one period but fails to win acceptance in the language. It was not likely, for example, that borrowings like assate, temulent, or suppeditate would take hold in English when we already had available the simpler terms roast, drunk, and supply. At other times the native word and the borrowed word continued to exist side by side, giving English a great variety of near synonyms: rot - decay, spit - expectorate, teach - instruct, sad - depressed.

B. Shifts of meaning

Many native English words have retained their original meanings throughout the centuries. Examples of such stable words are not hard to find: man, wife, house, eat, drink, and sleep. Such words rarely change their meanings, since they stand for fundamental ideas that form the basis of our vocabulary and are used daily by every speaker of the language. However, a great number of words, both native and borrowed, do undergo a great many shifts of meaning. Such changes of meaning, unless the reader is aware of them, can lead to serious misunderstanding of a writer's intention. The careless reader, for instance, may completely miss the significance of Brutus's comment to Cassius about honor and death: "Set honor in one eye and death i' the other, / And I will look on both indifferently. . ." (I. ii. 92-3). He does not use indifferently in the same sense that we use it today--that is, 'having no interest or feeling.' Certainly Brutus does have strong feelings about both honor and death. The fact is that he is using the word in the earlier meaning of 'having no preference or bias,' a meaning that throws an entirely different light upon Brutus's comment. Similarly, when Caesar says, "Be not fond / To think that Caesar bears such rebel blood. . ." (III. i. 43-4), he uses the word fond in the sense of 'foolish' or 'credulous,' not in the modern sense of 'affectionate' or 'loving.'

The word love is used throughout Julius Caesar in a sense which may seem strange to you. The present-day use of the word seems to have settled upon only two of its possible meanings: 'a strong liking for or interest in something' and 'a strong affection for a person of the opposite sex.' When Brutus says, ". . . Than that poor Brutus, with himself at war, / Forgets the shows of love to other men" (I. ii. 51-2), he uses the word in its earlier meaning of 'a strong affection for or attachment or devotion to a person or persons.' This is the sense in which the word is used throughout the play; only rarely does it occur in the sense of "romantic" love.

Two other words that show an interesting shift of meaning since the time of Shakespeare are prefer and entertain. If, in reading the final

scene of the play, you attached the common present-day meanings to these words, you were certain to become confused. Octavius says, "All that served Brutus, I will entertain them. / Fellow, wilt thou bestow thy time with me?" (V.v.66-7). In this speech he is not announcing a party to be held in honor of the losers; he is stating that he will hire Brutus's men as servants and soldiers, if they are willing. In answer to Octavius, Strato replies, "Ay, if Messala will prefer me to you." He does not mean, "Yes, if Messala will rank me before you in his affections." What he does mean is "Yes, if Messala will recommend me to you." Both entertain and prefer have lost these earlier meanings, and new meanings have supplanted them.

Exercise 1.

Using the notes in the Folger text and a dictionary, look up the following archaic words taken from the play and then define each one in the exact sense that Shakespeare uses it:

1. chidden (I.ii.191)
2. fain (I.ii.246)
3. wrought (I.ii.314)
4. fleering (I.iii.122)
5. betimes (II.i.123)
6. toils (II.i.219)
7. vouchsafe (II.i.331)
8. bootless (III.i.82)
9. belike (III.ii.283)
10. choler (IV.iii.43)
11. mace (IV.iii.306)
12. sooth (II.iv.23)
13. mo (V.iii.110)
14. bestow (V.v.67)

Exercise 2.

Explain how the meanings of each of the following words (as they are used in the play) differ from the common present-day meanings. For instance, the word glass (I.ii.73) is used to mean 'a mirror,' not a drinking glass.

1. naughty (I.i.15)
2. stale (I.ii.78)
3. bend (I.ii.129)
4. meet (I.ii.173)
5. favor (I.iii.135)
6. conceited (I.iii.139)
7. fret (II.i.111)
8. annoy (II.i.169)
9. humor (II.i.277)
10. rumor (II.iv.21)
11. schedule (III.i.3)
12. presently (III.i.155)

13. rank (III. i. 135)
14. censure (III. ii. 17)
15. lovers (III. ii. 14)
16. nice (IV. iii. 8)
17. braved (IV. iii. 107)
18. stay (V. i. 117)
19. malice (III. i. 187)
20. abide (III. i. 102)

III. Grammar of Early Modern English

A. Review of items from Part One

One of the most important ideas in the previous unit on the history of English was that Shakespeare's language, although different from ours in several parts of its grammar, is sufficiently like Modern English that we can read his plays and poems with little difficulty. In fact, it might not be farfetched to say that vocabulary differences between his language and ours are a greater obstacle to communication than are the differences in sentence structure. In Part One of the history of English, the following grammatical items were discussed: pronoun forms, verb forms, the auxiliary be + ing, yes/no question transformations, passive transformations, the auxiliary have + en, and negatives. In the following paragraphs these items will be reviewed and, where necessary, new information added. Again, all illustrative quotations will come from the Folger edition of Shakespeare's play, Julius Caesar.

Pronoun forms. Shakespeare employed several pronoun forms that are no longer used today. Thou, thee, thy, and thine are the second-person pronouns used by speakers of Early Modern English when speaking to close friends or people of inferior social position. You, ye, your, and yours are the ones they used when talking to people of higher social position or those to whom they wished to show respect. For instance, Brutus says to the Romans shortly after Caesar's murder, "You all did love him once. . ." (III. ii. 109), and Antony says to the conspirators who then hold his life in their hands, "I do beseech ye, if you bear me hard. . ." (III. i. 170). Significantly, Caesar uses the formal you when talking to his wife and also when speaking to Brutus and the other conspirators who have come to escort him to the Senate. But he uses thou when talking to the Soothsayer and to Antony, a trusted friend of Caesar's. The formal pronouns (except ye) have become the accepted forms in Modern English.

On the other hand, Shakespeare does not use the pronoun its in Julius Caesar. In fact, scholars have found only ten occurrences of this word in the First Folio edition of his plays. Instead, Shakespeare uses the form his: "My life is run his compass" (Cassius-V. iii. 26). It is very likely that its was more common in speech than in writing, since changes of this sort usually occur in the spoken language before they appear in print. Another use of pronouns that seems unusual today is mine and thine before words beginning with a vowel sound or h: "I think it is the weakness of mine eyes. . ." (Brutus-IV. iii. 314) and ". . .and at every putting-by mine / Honest neighbors shouted" (Casca-

I. ii. 236-7). This practice is much like the present-day use of the article an before words beginning with vowel sounds (an egg, an hour).

Verb forms. In Early Modern English, special verb forms no longer used today were employed in both second and third person. The second-person pronoun thou required -est to be added to the following verb or auxiliary: "If thou dost nod, thou break'st thy instrument. . ." (Brutus-IV. iii. 309). But, as the formal pronoun you gradually replaced thou, the -est forms disappeared from common usage and finally from formal writing. In the third person, the loss of -eth forms of the verb was well under way when Julius Caesar was written. Shakespeare was already using the -s forms of the verb (the common form in northern England) more frequently than the ones ending in -eth. Both types of inflection occur in the play; sometimes they occur together in the same statement: ". . .but it sufficeth / That Brutus leads me on" (Ligarius-II. ii. 352-3).

The careful reader may also have noticed some irregular past and past participle forms of some verbs. Chidden, swoonded, have took, have spoke, hath stricken, and is strucken all sound a bit peculiar, if not substandard, to most of us. But it is wise to remind yourself that Shakespeare and his fellow Englishmen had a variety of acceptable forms to choose from. Today, of course, the standard forms are rigidly prescribed, although alternate forms for some verbs do exist: dove - dived, learned - learnt, waked - woke, lighted - lit.

The auxiliary be + ing. You might remember that the use of be + ing as an auxiliary was not common in Early Modern English. You do know, of course, that today we use be + ing with all but a few of our English verbs. Shakespeare uses the form in Julius Caesar, but not frequently: "He did receive his letters and is coming" (Servant-III. i. 300) and "The games are done, and Caesar is returning" (Brutus-I. ii. 185). Rather than use the be + ing form, Shakespeare simply uses the main verb without any auxiliary except tense: ". . .He draws Mark Antony out of the way" (Cassius-III. i. 29) and "Cinna, where haste you so?" (Cassius-I. iii. 139). In summary, one could say that in 1600 the use of be + ing was not yet obligatory for expressing the progressive aspect--that is, the notion of an ongoing or uncompleted action.

Yes /No question transformations. In asking yes/no questions, Shakespeare often uses a word order different from our own. For example, Brutus asks, "Comes his army on?" (IV. ii. 29) and "Saw you anything?" (IV. iii. 345), and Calpurnia asks Caesar, "Think you to walk forth?" (II. ii. 8). In these examples, notice that the main verb and its tense have been moved to a position in front of the subject. In Modern English, we usually move only the tense to the position before the subject and then add the word do to carry the tense, as in "Did you see anything?" Notice also that we can do the same thing that Shakespeare does in making yes/no questions whenever the main verb is be or have. For instance, we can say, "Is he lazy?" or "Are they intruders?" And some Americans would say, "Have you the time?" and "Has he a brother?"; whereas others would prefer to say, "Do you have the time?" and "Does he have

a brother?" (or "Have you got. . .," "Has he got. . .").

Shakespeare could use the do form of questions, also. The following quotations contain exactly the same forms we would use today: "Did Cicero say anything?" (Cassius-I. ii. 283), "Must I endure all this?" (Cassius-IV. iii. 45), and "Will you stay awhile?" (Antony-III. ii. 160). In the last two examples, he follows the same pattern we do in Modern English for sentences in which an auxiliary other than tense (have, be, or a modal) comes beofre the main verb. That is, he moves a part of the auxiliary and the tense (must, will) to the position before the subject. Can you state the rules that you follow in making yes/no questions? Remember to use the symbols that you learned in your study of grammar. The transformation rules for both Early Modern English and Modern English were given in the previous unit on language history.

The auxiliary have + en. One important part of the English auxiliary that Shakespeare used in nearly the same way we do is the auxiliary have + en. He used it, as we do today, to form the so-called "perfect tenses": "Such instigations have been often dropped / Where I have took them up" (Brutus-II. i. 49-50). If you read the play very carefully, however, you notice that Shakespeare often uses the auxiliary be + en in expressions that would require have + en in Modern English: "And this man / Is now become a god. . ." (Cassius-I. ii. 121-2) and "The ides of March are come" (Caesar-III. i. 1). In both statements, a speaker of Modern English would have used have rather than be as the auxiliary. Both forms were acceptable usage in 1600.

The passive transformation. Shakespeare, like us, could make passive sentences out of sentences containing transitive verbs (those verbs taking objects). This is done by moving the object of the verb to the front of the sentence where it becomes the new subject, be + en is inserted between the main verb and the auxiliary (even if it is only tense), and the original subject is placed at the end of the sentence preceded by the word by. For example, "She bakes cakes" becomes by transformation "Cakes are baked by her." In both Shakespeare's grammar and ours, the word by and the original subject can be deleted from the sentence. Study the following passive constructions from the play:

". . .Octavius / Is overthrown by noble Brutus' power. . ."
(Messala-V. iii. 55-6)

". . .But it was famed with more than one man?" (Cassius-I. ii. 159)

As you can see in the above quotations, no major differences between the passive constructions of 1600 and those of today are apparent. Occasionally Shakespeare uses a preposition other than by to indicate the performer of the action, and sometimes the word order will seem strange to us. Other than these small differences, though, the passive transformation that Shakespeare used is identical with ours.

Negatives. Shakespeare's use of negatives (no, not, etc.) differs on several points with Modern English grammar. Like us, he added the word not after the first auxiliary in those verb phrases containing one or more of the following auxiliaries: have, be, and the modals (shall, will, can, may, must). For example, Caesar says, "They could not

find a heart within the beast" (II. ii. 42). In Modern English, we must add the word do when adding the negative to a sentence that contains no auxiliary but tense. (I want it. + negative ⟹ I do not want it.) On the other hand, Shakespeare could add the negative after the verb or even after the object of the verb (if it was a pronoun) and not use the word do at all: ". . . But I fear him not" (Caesar-I. ii. 205), "Our hearts you see not" (Brutus-III. i. 132), and "I / Like it not" (Cassius-I. ii. 262-3). He could also use the modern form with do: "I do not know the man I should avoid / So soon as that spare Cassius" (Caesar-I. ii. 207-8) and "I do not cross you; but I will do so" (Octavius-V. i. 21). As you remember from the previous unit, Shakespeare was not limited in the number of negatives he could use in any construction. Portia's comment to Brutus illustrates this feature of Early Modern English: "Nor for yours neither" (II. i. 252).

Exercise 3.

Choose a character from Julius Caesar and make a brief record of the pronoun forms he uses in addressing different persons. For example, how does Brutus address Cassius, Caesar, Casca, Portia, his servant boy, and Antony? Does he use the formal terms you and your, or does he use the ones reserved for close friends or inferiors?

Exercise 4.

Find and list at least two examples of the following:

1. A yes/no question in which the main verb (other than have or be) stands in front of the subject. For example, "Go you home?"
2. A yes/no question in which the auxiliary (have, be, or a modal) stands in front of the subject. For example, "Have you given him time?" or "Could he wait?"

Exercise 5.

Find and list at least five quotations from the play that have negatives (no, not, never, etc.) used in ways that differ from Modern English. For example, "I want it not."

B. Additional items of grammar

In Part One, several interesting aspects of Early Modern English were not discussed because of the limitations of time and space. In this unit, however, you will study several other ways in which your own grammar of English differs from that of Shakespeare. In the following sections, the grammars of Early Modern and Modern English will be compared and contrasted with respect to each of the following items: (1) use of relative pronouns, (2) requests and commands, (3) comparison of adjectives, (4) use of modals, and (5) use of the word do.

Use of relative pronouns. Shakespeare used the same relative pronouns that are found in Modern English: who, that, and which. Since these words also have other functions, you must remember that they are relative pronouns only when they replace noun phrases in sentences or parts of sentences. The underlined word in each of the following sentences is a relative: "He is the one who did it," "I know whom I prefer," "You are the man that said it," and "This is the spot which I was looking for." If the word that is used simply to subordinate one part of a sentence to another, it is not a relative but a subordinating conjunction, as in the following sentence: "He is certain that I am wrong." You should also remember that in Modern English the relative who is used for persons, which is used for nouns other than persons, and that can replace any noun.

With these facts in mind, let us take a look at the way Shakespeare used these important words. In reading the play, you probably noticed that the relative that occurs much more often than the other two. Scholars tell us the relative which came into use during the fifteenth century and the relative who did not come into common use until the sixteenth. Shakespeare generally used which for non-human nouns, but the 1611 edition of the English Bible reminds us that which could refer to persons also: "Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed by thy name" (Matthew 6:9). Casca uses who in place of a non-human noun when he says to Cicero, "Against the Capitol I met a lion, / Who glared upon me. . ." (I. iii. 20-1). The following quotations illustrate Shakespeare's ordinary use of who and which:

"Even at the base of Pompey's statue
(Which all the while ran blood) great Caesar fell." (Antony-III. ii. 199-200)

"There is a tide in the affairs of men
Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune. . ." (Brutus-IV. iii. 246-7)

"I should do Brutus wrong, and Cassius wrong,
Who, you all know, are honorable men." (Antony-III. ii. 134-5)

"Let it be who it is." (Casca-I. iii. 84)

The relative that could refer to any kind of noun and even to a preceding idea expressed in a sentence. Brutus says, "That we shall die, we know, 'tis but the time, / And drawing days out, that men stand upon" (III. i. 109-10). The antecedent of that is obviously the preceding phrase, "the time and drawing days out." The following quotations contain that used in reference to persons:

"Let me have men about me that are fat,
Sleek-headed men, and such as sleep o' nights." (Caesar-I. ii. 199-200)

"Who is here so base <u>that</u> would / be a bondman?" (Brutus-III. ii. 29-30)

And here are quotations in which <u>that</u> refers to non-human and inanimate nouns:

"It is a creature <u>that</u> I teach to fight. . ." (Antony-IV. i. 35)

"I may do <u>that</u> I shall be sorry for." (Cassius-IV. iii. 73)

"Brutus hath a suit / <u>That</u> Caesar will not grant." (Portia-II. iv. 48-9)

What conclusions can you draw from the preceding discussion? In what ways does Shakespeare's use of relative pronouns differ from your own?

<u>Requests and commands.</u> What important difference in sentence structure do you notice in the following examples of requests and commands taken from <u>Julius Caesar</u>?

"Look you here!" (Antony-III. ii. 207)

"Keep thou the left." (Octavius-V. i. 19)

"Stand you directly in Antonius' way. . ." (Caesar-I. ii. 5)

"Sit thee down, Clitus." (Brutus-V. v. 4)

In each of the above examples, a speaker of Modern English would have (among other things) deleted the subject of each verb and come up with something like the following: "Look here," "Keep to the left," "Stand directly in Antonius' way," and "Sit down, Clitus." Shakespeare follows the Modern English pattern for requests and commands in the following quotations:

"Give me thy hand, Messala." (Brutus-V. i. 31)

"Go to the gate, somebody knocks." (Brutus-II. i. 60)

"Read it, Mark Antony." (4th Plebian-III. ii. 149)

Notice also that whenever a negative is inserted into the command, the subject is usually deleted:

"Stir not until the signal." (Octavius-V. i. 27)

"Nay, press not so upon me." (Antony-III. ii. 178)

"Brutus, bait not me!" (Cassius-IV. iii. 30)

"Talk not of standing!" (Brutus-III. i. 97)

Try to put each of these expressions into Modern English. You will see not only how our requests and commands differ from those of Early Modern

English but also how essential the word do is in sentences containing negatives.

Comparison of adjectives. When Shakespeare compared the qualities of two or more things, he usually followed the same patterns used in Modern English. He added -er for the comparative and -est for the superlative:

"Ambition should be made of sterner stuff." (Antony-III. ii. 99)

"Thou art the ruins of the noblest man. . ." (Antony-III. i. 277)

Shakespeare also used, as we do, the words more and most for those words that do not take -er or -est or for words that can take either form of comparison:

". . .With the most noble blood of all this world." (Antony-III. i. 169)

". . .Ingratitude, more strong than traitor's arms. . ." (Antony-III. ii. 196)

"O, most bloody sight!" (1st Plebian-III. ii. 213)

The only significant difference between the two grammars, other than the restrictions upon which words can and cannot take the -er and -est comparison, lies in the fact that Shakespeare could combine the two forms of comparison in the same expression:

". . .and we will grace his heels
With the most boldest and best hearts of Rome." (Cassius-III. i. 132-3)

"This was the most unkindest cut of all. . ." (Antony-III. ii. 194)

Use of modals. Shakespeare used the same set of modals that are found in Modern English (may/might, can/could, shall/should, will/would, must), but he also made frequent use of dare, need, and ought as modals. In Modern English, we rarely use the last three words as modals except in negative statements. For example, "You need not ask for it" is an acceptable use of need as a modal. More commonly, however, need and dare are used as main verbs: "I need help," and "I'll dare anything to win the prize." Perhaps you remember that Shakespeare often used one of the other modals (will/would) as a main verb meaning 'wish' or 'desire.' Examples of Shakespeare's use of modals follow:

". . .I durst not laugh. . ." (Casca-I. ii. 255) (durst is past tense of dare)

". . .Which by the right and virtue of my place
I ought to know of. . ." (Portia-II. i. 284-5)

"How that might change his nature. . ." (Brutus-II. i. 13)

". . .for his silver hairs / Will purchase us good opinion. . ." (Metellus-II. i. 152-3)

"It shall be said his judgment ruled our heads. . ." (Metellus-II. i. 155)

". . .Caesar must bleed for it!" (Brutus-II. i. 180)

Use of the word "do". In the sections dealing with questions and negatives, you have already considered some uses of the word do. Shakespeare could use the word do in asking questions ("Did Cicero say anything?"), and he could use the word do in making negative statements ("I do not cross you"); whereas speakers of Modern English must use do in both of these constructions when there is no auxiliary but tense in the verb phrase. Early Modern English do appears in still other sentences in which its function is neither to help make negative statements nor to help in asking questions. It appears as an optional element in front of any verb and carries the tense marker. In its earliest uses, the effect of the word do seems to be that of emphasizing the force of whatever verb it precedes. In Shakespeare's writing, however, the do is more often used to provide another unstressed syllable whenever the rhythm of the line requires one. The following speech by Cassius illustrates this function:

"And when the fit was on him, I did mark
How he did shake. 'Tis true, this god did shake.
His coward lips did from their color fly,
And that same eye whose bend doth awe the world
Did lose his luster. I did hear him groan," (I. ii. 126-30)

It is possible that the emphatic use of do, since it was present in English much earlier than the other uses of the word, may have helped extend its use in other constructions like negatives and questions. You must, of course, be careful to distinguish between the lexical verb do (for example, "I do my work") and the word do in any of its other functions. It would be no overstatement to say that do is one of the most useful words in the English language.

Exercise 6.

A. Find and list at least five quotations from the play that contain who or which used as a relative pronoun. Remember that to be a relative pronoun the who or which must replace a noun phrase in the sentence. For example, who is a relative in the following sentence: "I know who did it."

B. Find and list any quotations from the play that contain adjectives which are compared in a way not acceptable in Modern English usage. "Double" comparisons like "most unkindest" and "most boldest" are considered incorrect today.

C. Find and list any quotations from the play that contain the words dare (past: durst), ought, or need used as modals in verb phrases. For example, the following sentences contain these words used as modals:

"I dare not go home," "You ought not say that," or "I need not ask for him."

IV. The Sounds of English

You probably recognize that a very important part of Shakespeare's language--its pronunciation--has not been discussed at all so far in this brief history of Early Modern English. It is no accident that the pronunciation of Shakespeare's English has been left to the last; the reason is, of course, that pronunciation is the most difficult part of a language to write about. You recognize the important fact that no one can call back from the grave a single speaker of Early Modern English. And you also know that before the invention of the phonograph in 1877 we had no way of recording sound. In fact, only very recently have scientists and technicians been able to reproduce sound in a way that is truly satisfactory. How, you might well ask, can we discuss something that no living person has experienced directly? How can anyone discover the actual pronunciation of Shakespeare's English?

Scholars have devised various means for finding out how words were pronounced at an earlier stage of a language, even though the only things they have to work with are the written records of that language. One very interesting method is to look through letters and diaries written during the period being studied. In these documents, words are often misspelled in such a way that the common pronunciation is unmistakably shown. Huck Finn, for example, gives the reader a clue to Huck's own pronunciation when he misspells resk, dasn't, warn't, and Injun. Another way to determine pronunciation from written records is to make an analysis of the different rhymes that poets used during the period. For example, from Shakespeare's plays we have discovered that he could rhyme flood not only with blood but also with mood and even good. And, as we find out how some words are pronounced, this knowledge helps us determine the sounds of others. Since the placement of accent or stress affects the value of some sounds, poets again help us when they use the word in a line where we can definitely figure out which syllable receives the stress. From such analysis, for example, we find that Shakespeare pronounced persevere with the accent on the second syllable rather than on the third, as we do. Sometimes writers make statements about the pronunciation of their own times. Such accounts are most helpful, since the writer is an eyewitness, so to speak. In many ways, then, scholars can determine quite accurately how a language was spoken in some earlier period.

Let us go back to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries for a moment and consider a few facts about English speech and writing. By the time of Shakespeare's birth, the written language of London had been established for over a century as the standard written language for most of the island of England. This meant, of course, that whenever a writer chose to publish a book, he followed the written forms then used by educated Londoners, not those of some other English dialect. Since London had become an important center of trade and government, it is only natural that surrounding areas looked to it as a guide in choosing the "best" language and the "proper" forms to put it in.

The influence of the language of London was felt not only in the written standards of Englishmen but in their spoken language as well. The regional dialects of England continued to be spoken in those regions outside London, but most Englishmen recognized the London dialect as being something very special. Today, of course, the dialect of the educated Londoner is the Standard Spoken English of all England. It is the dialect taught in the great universities, and a man who hopes to become someone of importance in public life in England usually masters this dialect.

The situation described above had unfortunate results for students of language who now want to find out how English was spoken in parts of England outside London. Spelling is naturally a good clue to pronunciation, but it became a less helpful one (at least for the pronunciation of other English dialects) after the time that writers began to use only the spelling conventions of London. In this unit, however, we will examine the writing of Shakespeare's time in order to find out how English was spoken in London in 1600.

Shakespeare may have spoken English in his native Warwickshire dialect, since it is possible that the pronunciation he learned as a child would have some effect upon his speech in later years. But when he wrote his poems and plays--and when the printers later set them up in type--the spelling and punctuation of London were used consistently. It may already have occurred to some of you that perhaps, like our present-day spelling system, the spelling of Shakespeare's time did not represent accurately all the sounds of London English. This is precisely the case, but then it is not unusual for a writing system to be out of tune with the spoken sounds of the language it represents. Some of the causes for a "lack of fit" between the sounds of a language and the system of symbols used to write it have been discussed in a previous unit dealing with writing systems. Among these causes is the somewhat disturbing fact (disturbing for some people, that is) that the sounds of speech are constantly undergoing change.

A. Sound change

The highly complex nature of changes in speech sounds prevents us from considering all but the simplest types of change. Often sounds are lost because they come at the ends of words or in some other syllable that is not stressed. The "silent e" that occurs at the end of many English words (note, name, ride) is an example of such a sound change. In 1400, the word name was pronounced with two syllables: na me (rather like the vowel sounds in comma). Since then, the final vowel sound (pronounced like the final sound in sofa) has been lost, but we continue to write e. More important than this change is the fact that nearly all the vowel sounds of English changed their values in one way or another during the years between 1400 and 1600. Some vowels have undergone further change since then. Needless to say, changes in the writing of these vowels have not kept pace with the actual changes in the sounds. But it was not only the vowel sounds that underwent change. The spelling of words like thought and right are constant reminders that English once had a speech sound that has been lost. The word right once contained a sound, here represented by the spelling gh, that was much

like the German ch, as in Bach, or the Scottish ch, as in loch. In a word like laugh, this sound has become the same as that usually represented by our letter f. An interesting contrast with our pronunciation of laugh is the German lachen, 'to laugh,' in which the middle consonant sound is nearly identical with the older English sound.

For many reasons, then, the sounds of our language change, whether we want them to or not. Although you may not notice it, the sounds of American English are also undergoing change. You can be certain that the pronunciation of following generations of Americans will be different from your own. Whether the spelling of our language will be modified to reflect these changes cannot be predicted. Such spelling reforms are a matter of convention and can be brought about whenever people agree to make them. The writing systems of some modern languages have been changed extensively in recent years, so reform is not altogether out of the question.

B. A special pronunciation alphabet

In several examples above, we have had need of a special system of writing. We cannot rely upon regular spelling to indicate how a word is pronounced, since English spelling is not entirely consistent. Our writing system does not always represent a particular sound with the same unchanging symbol, nor does a letter always represent just one sound. For example, the regular sound of the letter k can be spelled as c, ck, or k. On the other hand, the sound represented by the letter s can be /s/ as in sit, /z/ as in rise, /š/ as in sure, or /ž/ as in measure. In order to compare and contrast the sounds of Shakespeare's English with our own, we will have to devise a special alphabet in order to insure accuracy and consistency. The following set of symbols will be used to represent the distinctive sounds of English:

Consonant Sounds

b - boy	θ - thin
p - pat	s - sin
t - tap	š - ship
k - king	v - vat
c - chap	ð - that
d - day	z - zip
j - junk	ž - measure
g - get	m - man
f - find	n - not

Consonant Sounds

ŋ - sing

l - lap

r - rat

Vowel Sounds

i - pin

ī - peel

ɨ - boxer

u - put

ū - boot

o - caught, law

ō - coat

ə - putt, cut

e - pet

ē - pate

æ - that

a - not, father

Semi-vowels

w - win

y - yet

h - hope

Diphthongs

ay - bite

aw - bout

oy - boy

These thirty-nine symbols will always be enclosed within a pair of virgules (that is, slanting lines / /) so that you can tell when we are discussing a sound rather than the letter itself.

C. Shakespeare's pronunciation

One reassuring fact about the sounds of English is that many of them are very stable--that is, they have not changed much, if at all, over the centuries. Those sounds listed above under the heading of "Consonants", are among the most stable of English sounds. For instance, the sound represented by the letter t in Old English (450 -1150A. D

is nearly the same sound we spell with a t today. Since there are few consonant changes to concern ourselves with, let us begin the discussion with this set of sounds.

Consonant changes. Four consonant sounds of Modern English are slightly different in Early Modern English. Shakespeare spelled them exactly the same way we do, but scholars have discovered that they were pronounced differently. In each of the four consonant changes, the sounds have become simplified. In Modern English, the word soldier is pronounced /sōl jɨr /, the second syllable beginning with a /j/ sound, as in jump. Shakespeare, however, would have pronounced the word like /sōl dy ɨr/. Notice that the word has three syllables, somewhat like the word earlier. Two other words that illustrate this same feature are cordial /kōr dy al/ and grandeur /græn dy ur/. Our own pronunciation would be more like /kōr jəl / and /græn jɨr/. Similarly, in a word such as fortune, Shakespeare's pronunciation differs. Modern English pronunciation is /fōr cən/, but in 1600 it was /fōr ty un/. In Modern English, the consonant that begins the second syllable is a /c/ sound, as church. Two other words that illustrate this same sound change are nature /nē cɨr / and venture /ven cɨr/. Shakespeare would have said /næ ty ur/ and /ven ty ur/. Thus we can say that Early Modern English /dy/ became /j/ in Modern English; similarly, Early Modern English /ty/ became /c/ in Modern English. Educated Americans in certain parts of the southeastern United States have this same /ty/ in a word like literature.

Similarly, Early Modern English /sy/ and /zy/ have become /š/ and /ž/, respectively, in our pronunciation. We pronounce the word

mission as /mi ʃə n/, but Shakespeare would have said /mi sy ən/. We pronounce the words issue and censure as /i ʃū/ and /sen ʃir/. How would Shakespeare have said them? Try to write the sounds using the special symbols given above. The other cluster, /zy/, is found in the Early Modern English pronunciation of words like vision, measure, and pleasure. We pronounce the first of these three words like /vi ʒən/, but Shakespeare would have said /vi zy ən/. Try to write the other words as they would be pronounced in Early Modern English and then in Modern English.

Vowel sounds. Several of Shakespeare's vowel sounds changed between his time and ours. Throughout this discussion you must keep in mind that the Modern English pronunciations given in this unit represent the dialect of the northwestern United States. If you are a native of some other region of the country, it will be necessary to have the pronunciation keys modified to fit your particular dialect. Some vowel sounds vary a good deal even within a dialect area. For example, some of your classmates may /waš/ in /watir/, /woš/ in /watir/, or /waš/ in /wotir/. In England, of course, they /woš/ in /wotə /. These variations in pronunciation were present in the dialects of English brought to America in the seventeenth century, and today our pronunciations still differ. The pronunciation of wash as /woš/ is most common in the midland dialect areas of the United States, and, interestingly enough an /r/ sound often intrudes after the vowel, resulting in a pronunciation something like /worš/.

One vowel sound of Shakespeare's English that changed is the one in words like God, not, body, and on. We say each of these words with the sound of /a/, as in father: /gad/, /nat/, /badĭ/, and either /an/

or /on/. Shakespeare, however, would have consistently used the vowel /o/, as in caught or law. He would have pronounced the four examples as /god/, /not/, /bodī/, and /on/. The vowel sound that he used is more "rounded" than ours--that is, the corners of the mouth are drawn to the center when it is spoken.

Another vowel that is different in Early Modern English is the one in yard, father, want, and was. We pronounce these as /yard/, /faðir/, /want/, and either /waz/ or /woz/, respectively; but Shakespeare would have used a vowel like the one in that: /yæ rd/, /fæ ðir/, /wæ nt/, and /wæ z/. Still another difference could be heard in the pronunciation of words like come, blood, month, and mother. Our pronunciation has a vowel sound like the one in cut: /kəm/, /bləd/, /mənθ/, and /məðir/. But Shakespeare would have used a vowel like the /u/ in put: /kum/, /blud/, /munθ/, and /muðir/.

The words spelled with ea are a reminder of still another difference between our pronunciation and Shakespeare's. We pronounce clean, sea, beast, feast, and mean with the same vowel sound that we use in seen, tee, and pieced. In 1600, words spelled with ea usually had the vowel sound /ē/, as in take. Thus Shakespeare would have said /klēn/, /sē/, /bēst/, /fēst/, and /mēn/ as opposed to our /klīn/, /sī/, /bīst/, /fīst/, and /mīn/. Sixteenth century poets could, for instance, rhyme may with words like tea and sea. In Modern English, the letters ea, ie, and ee are usually pronounced as /ī/.

Speakers of Early Modern English pronounced the vowel sound in words like face, name, and stale as /æ/, the same vowel that we have in cat. In present-day English, the vowel in these same words is /ē/: /fēs/, /nēm/, and /stēl/. Shakespeare would have said /f æ s/,

/næ m/, and /stæ l/. The vowel used by Shakespeare, /æ/, was longer in duration than our present-day /æ/ sound--that is, the Early Modern English vowel /æ/ took longer for the speaker to pronounce it. In the words play, nay, day, and frail, the vowel sound in Modern English is /ē/: /plē/, /nē/, /dē/, and /frēl/. In Shakespeare's English, this vowel was a diphthong, a combination of two vowel sounds. Thus the Early Modern English pronunciation of the examples given above would be /pl æ i/, /næ i/, /dæ i/, and /fræ il /.

Several words that have the diphthong /ay/ in Modern English had a slightly different diphthong in Shakespeare's time. Today, the words my, by, I, and like are pronounced as /may/, /bay/, /ay/, and /layk/, but Shakespeare would have said something like /moi/, /boi/, /io/, and /loik/. Part of the difference lies in the fact that the first vowel of the Early Modern English diphthong is more rounded than the corresponding sound in the Modern English diphthong. This same sort of difference is seen in Shakespeare's pronunciation of such words as how, now, thou, and prow. He would pronounce these words as follows: /how/, /now/, /ŏow/, and /prow/. Notice that the first vowel of the diphthong is the rounded /o/, just as in the examples given previously. On the other hand, we pronounce these words with the diphthong /aw/: /haw/, /naw/, /ŏaw/, and /praw/. The Modern English diphthong begins with an unrounded /a/ sound, not the rounded /o/. In at least one American dialect, it is the difference between the vowels of not /nat/ and law /lo/.

Exercise 7.

Look back through the play and try to find puns that contain clues to Shakespeare's pronunciation. A pun is a verbal jest which consists of a play on two different words which are unrelated but which have the

same pronunciation. In the opening scene of Julius Caesar, the Cobbler makes such a pun on the words sole and soul when he says, ". . .a mender of bad soles" (I. i. 14). Another type of pun is that which arises out of two different meanings of the same word. The speaker intends one meaning, but the listener may understand the other, and in this ambiguity lies the fun. In Shakespeare's play Romeo and Juliet, Mercutio cannot resist punning even though he has been wounded mortally: "Ask for me tomorrow and you shall find me a grave man" (III. i. 100-1). Some puns, because they depend upon a similarity of sound, tell us certain facts about Shakespeare's pronunciation. For example, he could pun upon the words eat and hate and upon steal and stale. Find and list any puns that you find in Julius Caesar. As a beginning, look at the following: Rome and room (Cassius-I. ii. 162) and lief and live (Cassius-I. ii. 101).

Exercise 8.

Make a list of the pairs of words that Shakespeare rhymes in the play. Look for them at the end of a scene or an act, since this is where they most often occur. For example, Act I, Scene iii, ends with the rhyme sure and endure.

Notice if these rhymes seem imperfect in your own pronunciation. What could this mean? Not all rhymes are intended to be perfect ones, so be careful not to draw conclusions that are not warranted.

Exercise 9.

How might Shakespeare have pronounced the following words? Indicate the pronunciation of each word by means of the set of symbols on pages 14-15 of this unit. For example: censure - /sen sy ur/.

1. Cassius (I. ii. 34)
2. passions (I. ii. 45)
3. lead (I. ii. 68)
4. ambitions (II. i. 22)
5. virtue (I. ii. 96)
6. leap (I. ii. 109)
7. entreat (I. ii. 172)
8. vesture (III. ii. 207)
9. issue (III. i. 316)
10. schedule (III. i. 3)
11. statue (II. ii. 80)
12. deaf (I. ii. 220)
13. shook (I. ii. 288)
14. gods (I. iii. 12)
15. name (I. iii. 76)
16. mean (I. iii. 83)
17. fathers' (I. iii. 86)
18. mothers' (I. iii. 87)
19. bloody (I. iii. 136)
20. day (I. iii. 160)

21. progress (II. i. 2)

22. bright (II. i. 14)

V. Conclusions

As you look back over the units dealing with the history of English, keep in mind that very often the facts have been simplified in order to keep the discussion from bogging down. Language change is a highly complex process that specially trained linguists study continuously, but as yet there is much that remanis unknown. In studying sound changes, for example, we see one sound used in 1600 and another sound in the same word in 1900, but linguists are still trying to figure out what caused the shift.

The purpose of this unit has been to give you a fairly accurate picture of the English language at a particular stage in its development. If you have read carefully, you should know some very important facts about Shakespeare's vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation. Knowing these facts should prove valuable to you while studying the language of Chaucer in a later unit. The English of 1400 will not seem nearly as strange to you if you have clearly understood the differences that exist between Modern English and the language of Shakespeare.

Vi. Additional Readings

The following books contain much additional information about the history of the English language, particularly about the language of Shakespeare:

1. Francis, W. Nelson, The History of English, W.W. Norton Co., New York, 1963. A brief survey of both the external and internal history of English, written in easily understandable language.

2. Holzknecht, Karl J., The Backgrounds of Shakespeare's Plays. American Book Co., New York, 1950. Chapter 8, "Shakespeare's English," contains abundant material on the vocabulary of 1600 and some information on Shakespeare's pronunciation.

3. Hulme, Hilda M., Explorations in Shakespeare's Language. The University Press, Aberdeen, Great Britain, 1963. Chapters V and VI, "'Latin' Reference in Shakespearean English" and "Spelling Habits and Pronunciation Variants," are especially good.

VII. Additional Assignments

A. Test your knowledge of Shakespeare's English by translating into Modern English a scene (or part of a scene) from Julius Caesar. You must remember to use your dictionary to check for the possibility

that Shakespeare has used a word in a sense that is no longer current.

B. Continue (or begin) the building of a Shakespeare lexicon, a list of words that he has used in unusually interesting ways. Each entry might contain information like the following: (1) the word itself, (2) the quotation in which it is found, (3) the probable meaning intended by Shakespeare, (4) present-day meanings, and (5) any other pertinent information.

C. Using the special alphabet on pages 14-15 of this unit, write out a speech from the play as you believe Shakespeare would have spoken it in 1600.